

REMARKS

The Office Action rejected all of the claims as allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) by the patent to *Culli et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,205,214. This rejection is respectfully traversed. *Culli et al.* fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of the pending claims.

If the clarification below does not convince the examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone interview to discuss the patentable differences between the claimed subject matter of this application and the cited reference, *Culli et al.* These differences were pointed out in the Amendment and Response to the first Office Action, but the description of the differences was not properly understood because that description has been, unfortunately, misinterpreted in the recently received Final Office Action.

In sum, generally, the claimed subject matter centralizes the processes that are carried out in a distributed fashion in *Culli et al.* In the claimed subject matter, all calls from resold lines that are received at end offices are routed by those end offices to a hub. A hub may be an AIN Hub, which is a network element, and which may be a service switching point (SSP). The hub queries another network element, such as a service control point (SCP), for routing instructions. Upon receipt of the routing instruction, the hub routes the calls.

In contrast, *Culli et al.* includes no element and fails to suggest any element like the hub of the claimed subject matter. *Culli et al.* is like the prior art described in the background of this patent application. *Culli et al.* includes service switching points (SSPs) as end offices and each of those

end offices has to contact an SCP for routing instructions. Thus, each of *Culli et al.*'s switches has to maintain current information on all of the local service providers. Each time a new service provider enters the market or similar event occurs, each and every one of *Culli et al.*'s switches must be updated with information related to the event. The result, at least, is the inefficient use of the respective memory/storage devices of *Culli et al.*'s SSPs.

To further clarify the differences between the claimed subject matter and *Culli et al.*, Exhibit A is attached and includes simplified drawings from the application and from *Culli et al.* At the top of Exhibit A, the drawing illustrates that all calls from resold lines received in SSP 60, End Office 22, or End Office 64 are routed to AIN Hub 190. The AIN Hub obtains instructions from SCP 200.


In contrast, the drawing in the bottom half of Exhibit A illustrates that each of *Culli et al.*'s SSPs 34, 36, 38, 40 makes queries to the ISCP 30, and each of these SSPs receives instructions from the ISCP 30.

To more particularly point out the differences between the claimed subject matter and *Culli et al.*, some of the claims have been amended by substitution of the term "hub" for "service switching point".

CONCLUSION

The Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application in light of the remarks above. If there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Nora Tocups at 404-372-1430.

Respectfully submitted,



Nora M. Tocups
Reg. No. 35,717
Attorney for the Assignee

Law Office of Nora M. Tocups
Post Office Box 698
Decatur, Georgia 30031
404-372-1430
ntocups@bellsouth.net
Attorney Docket No. 0201-97055